

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

New dependent claims 19 and 20 have been added. No new matter has been added.

This amendment adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application, of which claims 13-18 are withdrawn from consideration.

Allowable subject matter

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 2-12 contain allowable subject matter.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,052,230 to Clark ("Clark"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an optical substrate and recites "said at least one optical structure is determined in part by at least one randomly generated component of modulation wherein the modulation of each of said at least one optical structure is limited by a neighboring optical structure comprised by the surface." (emphasis added). Thus, in claim 1, the modulation of each optical structure is limited by a neighboring optical structure. As one non-limiting example of limiting the modulation by a neighboring structure, the specification in paragraph [0042] describes limiting the modulation of the absolute value of a phase component of a function describing the optical structure such that adjacent tool paths (which help define the optical structures) are less than π radians out of phase.

By contrast to claim 1, Clark does not disclose the feature where "at least one optical structure is determined in part by at least one randomly generated component of modulation

wherein the modulation of each of said at least one optical structure is limited by a neighboring optical structure comprised by the surface.” Clark discloses an optical filter for intentionally blurring camera images, where the contour of the filter is preferably random (abstract). Clark discloses different embodiments of the filter in Figures 6-9, where different parameters of structures of the filter are randomized. Figure 6 describes a filter where the position and size of circular lenslets are randomized; Figure 7, where elliptical lenslets have substantially random positions, angular orientations, sizes and powers, and overlap; Figure 8, where regular lenslets have random power; and Figure 9, where regions have random thicknesses.

In contrast to claim 1, however, Clark nowhere discloses or suggests that the random modulation of the structures on its filter are limited by neighboring structures on the filter. Thus, Clark fails to disclose all the features of claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable thereover for at least this reason.

Independent claim 13 includes all the limitations of claim 1, and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, new claim 19 recites “said at least one optical structure represents an idealized prismatic structure.” Clark discloses no prismatic structures that are modulated in its filter. As another example, new claim 20 recites “said at least one optical structure represents an idealized structure characterized by a function, wherein a phase of the function is randomly or pseudo randomly modulated.” Clark fails to disclose randomly modulating the phase of any function describing the structure on its filter.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

January 9, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5490
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By

Michael D. Kaminski

Michael D. Kaminski
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,904

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438